

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF MISSOURI
EASTERN DIVISION

CHLOE HAPPE,

Plaintiff,

v.

BLOCK, INC.,

Defendant.

Case No. 4:24-cv-00622-MTS

**DEFENDANT’S UNOPPOSED MOTION SEEKING CLARIFICATION
AND FOR EXTENSION OF TIME TO RESPOND TO MOTION TO REMAND**

Defendant Block, Inc. (“Block”), by and through its undersigned counsel, respectfully moves for an Order clarifying its obligation to respond to Plaintiff’s Motion to Remand in light of the pending Joint Motion to Stay the Case Pending Arbitration and, if applicable, further moves for an Order extending Block’s time to oppose the Motion to Remand. This Motion is made in good faith and not for the purpose of vexation, harassment, or undue delay. Plaintiff does not oppose this Motion.

In support of this Motion, Block states as follows:

1. Plaintiff initially filed her Complaint in the Forty-Fifth Circuit Court, Lincoln County, Missouri, on March 28, 2024. Dkt. 1, Ex. A.
2. On May 3, 2024, Block timely removed the case to this Court. Dkt. 1.
3. On May 23, 2024, Plaintiff filed a Motion to Remand. Dkt. 15.
4. On May 24, 2024, the Parties filed a Joint Motion to Stay the Case Pending Arbitration. Dkt. 16. In the Joint Motion, the Parties asked the Court to stay “[a]ll proceedings in this action, including but not limited to any motion for remand to Lincoln County, Missouri,

Circuit Court, and any deadline to oppose such motion” pending the completion of the arbitration. *Id.* at 2. As noted in the Joint Motion, Block opposes Plaintiff’s Motion to Remand. *Id.*

5. Both Plaintiff’s Motion to Remand and the Parties’ Joint Motion to Stay the Case Pending Arbitration are currently pending before this Court.

6. Pursuant to Local Rule 4.01(B), absent a stay, Block’s opposition to Plaintiff’s Motion to Remand is due on June 6, 2024.

7. Pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 6(b) and Local Rule 1.05, the Court may extend a party’s deadline for good cause. Good cause exists to extend Block’s deadline to file its opposition to Plaintiff’s Motion to Remand here because the Parties’ Joint Motion to Stay the Case Pending Arbitration is currently pending.

WHEREFORE, for the foregoing reasons, Block respectfully requests that the Court enter an Order clarifying Block’s obligation to respond to Plaintiff’s Motion to Remand in light of the pending Joint Motion to Stay the Case Pending Arbitration. In the event the Court intends to resolve the Motion to Remand before addressing the Joint Motion to Stay, Block respectfully requests that the Court enter an Order extending Block’s time to respond to the Motion to Remand up to and including June 20, 2024.

Dated: June 4, 2024

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Patricia J. Martin

Patricia J. Martin, Bar No. 57420MO
Lillian T. Manning, Bar No. 68432MO
LITTLER MENDELSON, P.C.
600 Washington Avenue
Suite 900
St. Louis, MO 63101
Telephone: 314.659.2000
Facsimile: 314.667.3760
pmartin@littler.com
lmanning@littler.com

Jason C. Schwartz, *Admitted Pro Hac Vice*
Naima L. Farrell, *Admitted Pro Hac Vice*
Catherine McCaffrey, *Admitted Pro Hac Vice*
GIBSON, DUNN & CRUTCHER LLP
1050 Connecticut Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20036-5306
Telephone: 202.955.8500
Facsimile: 202.467.0539
jschwartz@gibsondunn.com
nfarrell@gibsondunn.com
cmccaffrey@gibsondunn.com

Attorneys for Defendant Block, Inc.

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

The undersigned hereby certifies that a true and correct copy of the foregoing was filed with the Clerk of the Court on this June 4, 2024, using the CM/ECF system, which will send notification of such filing to:

Timothy Belz, Esq.
J. Matthew Belz, Esq.
CLAYTON PLAZA LAW GROUP, LC
112 South Hanley, Suite 200
Clayton, MO 63105

Gene C. Schaerr, Esq.
H. Christopher Bartolomucci, Esq.
Edward H. Trent, Esq.
SCHAERR JAFFE LLP
1717 K Street NW, Suite 900
Washington, DC 20006

Attorneys for Plaintiff

/s/ Patricia J. Martin
Patricia J. Martin